

REMARKS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated March 21, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action"), in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 10-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as allegedly indefinite and ambiguous; 2) rejected claims 1-8, 10-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Vaidanathan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,031,669, hereinafter "Vaidanathan") in view of Baldwin et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,735,422, hereinafter "Baldwin"); and 3) rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Vaidanathan in view of Baldwin, and further in view of Tellado et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 20040198276, hereinafter "Tellado"). In this Response, Applicants have added new claims 22-35, and canceled claims 10-14 and 20-21. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe this case to be in condition for allowance.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner rejected claims 10-14 and 20-21 as allegedly indefinite and ambiguous, asserting that the claims recite both an apparatus and method steps of using the apparatus. Without conceding the merits of the Examiner's assertion, Applicants have cancelled claims 10-14 and 20-21, rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-14 and 20-21 as allegedly obvious over Vaidanathan in view of Baldwin, acknowledging that Vaidanathan does not specifically disclose "calibrating an AGC comprising the steps of transmitting an AGC calibration signal, receiving and decoding the calibrating signal to produce a measurement, storing the measurement, changing an AGC gain setting and repeating the transmitting, receiving, decoding, storing and changing operations to determine an optimal AGC gain setting" (Office Action, ¶ 4), but alleging that these same limitations are disclosed by Baldwin. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of the cited art, noting that Baldwin does not teach a calibration process for an automatic gain control (AGC), and further does not teach a calibration process that includes transmitting and

receiving an AGC compensation signal. Baldwin instead teaches a calibration process for a DC offset compensation circuit that includes generating a calibration signal used only to calibrate a DC offset circuit. Specifically, Baldwin teaches that “[i]n one configuration, the adjust value is a multiplier value which is multiplied by the initial conversion value determined by the gain converter 331 and the result is used as the G_{CON} signal to control the DC amplifier 333,” and also that “In alternative embodiments, the calibration block 401 may simply assert a calibration signal that is used for adjusting the G_{CON} signal.” Baldwin, col. 17, lines 37-48 and Fig. 4. Baldwin does not teach or even suggest “determining an optimal AGC gain setting” as required by claim 1, or “transmitting an AGC calibration signal” as asserted by the Examiner.

Applicants further note that Baldwin teaches an AGC that is distinct from the DC compensation circuit taught and which does not make use of any signal generated by calibration block 401. See Baldwin, Fig. 4 (DC LOOP, AGC LOOP, Calibration 401, and PGM). Thus, Baldwin does not provide any suggestion to combine the DC offset compensation taught with an AGC, and arguably teaches away from such a combination. Further, none of the cited art overcomes the deficiencies of Baldwin. Thus, none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, teaches or even suggests all of the elements of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all claims that depend upon it, are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner further rejected dependent claim 9 as allegedly obvious over Vaidanathan in view of Baldwin and further in view of Tellado. Applicants respectfully submit that because none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, teaches or even suggests all of the elements of independent claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends, claim 9 is also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as those presented with respect to independent claim 1.

III. NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new claims 22-35, which include independent claims 22 and 30. These independent claims include elements similar to those of independent claim 1, and Applicants thus respectfully submit that for at least the reasons presented

above regarding claim 1, independent claims 22 and 30, together with their respective dependent claims, are all in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Texas Instruments Inc.'s Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roberto de Leon/

Roberto de Leon
PTO Reg. No. 58,967
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS